

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yew et al. (above) in view of Panchou et al. (above) and/or Clayton (above) and further in view of Tanioka (U.S. Patent No. 5,784,264) and Egawa (U.S. Patent No. 6,229,215).

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yew et al. (above) in view of Panchou et al. (above) and further in view of Bertin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,977,640).

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yew et al. (above) in view of Panchou et al. (above) and further in view of Akram et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,051,878).

Claims 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yew et al. (above) in view of Panchou et al. (above) and Clayton (above) as applied to claims 1-4.

The above rejections are respectfully traversed. The filing date of Yew et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,137,164) is September 22, 1999, and is later than the priority date for the present application. Applicant of the present invention has made a claim for priority based on Taiwan Patent Application No. 88212813 dated July 30, 1999, which precedes the filing date of Yew et al. (September 22, 1999). The certified copy of the above Taiwan Patent Application No. 88212813 was submitted on November 10, 1999. A certified English translation of the priority application will be forwarded as soon as it is received.

Applicant notes Yew et al. attempted to claim priority under 35 U.S.C. 119 based upon Singapore Application No. 9803203 filed September 29, 1998. However, a certified copy of the above Singapore Application was not filed as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b), and the claim for priority was not perfected. The file history in Yew et al. does not indicate that such a document was ever filed to perfect the claim for priority. In fact, on page 2 of the Office Action issued May 31, 2000 in Yew et al. it is noted a certified copy of Singapore Application No. 9803203 was not filed. A copy of this page is enclosed herewith. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the patent to Yew et al. is not entitled the benefit of an earlier filing date than September 22, 1999. Accordingly, the above rejections are no longer applicable to the claims.

Regarding the remaining references cited in the above rejections, these references, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the features of the claimed invention as required by claims 1, 19 and 20. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted claims 1, 19 and 20 are patentable. In addition, it is respectfully submitted claims 2-6 and 21, which respectively depend upon and further limit claims 1 and 20, also are patentable.


Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

With the above remarks, Applicant believes this application is in a condition for allowance. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested. If any further questions arise, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD, P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

Dated: March 25, 2002

By:   
Michael D. Schumann  
Reg. No. 30,422

MDS/BAW



Application/Control Number: 09/401,568  
Art Unit: 2814



RECEIVED  
APR -1 2002  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Page 2

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Priority*

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in 09/401,568 on 9/22/99. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the Singapore 9803203 application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

### *Oath/Declaration*

2. The oath or declaration is defective because: it does not identify the foreign application for patent or inventor's certificate on which priority is claimed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.55, and any foreign application having a filing date before that of the application on which priority is claimed, by specifying the application number, country, day, month and year of its filing.

### *Drawings*

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: 520, 831, and 832. Correction is required.